

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being drawn to non-statutory subject matter; and rejected claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,589,947 to Sato et al. ("*Sato*").

Applicant has amended claims 7-10 and canceled claim 11. Claims 7-10 remain pending.

Regarding the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Applicant has amended claim 10 to recite a "computer-readable recording medium storing a computer-executable program which, when executed by a processor, performs a method for controlling a first information processing apparatus and a second information processing apparatus," thereby positively reciting a structure. Therefore, claim 10 falls within the categories of patentable subject matter, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Sato*. In order to properly establish that *Sato* anticipates Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." See

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 7 recites an apparatus including, for example:

...
a request means for requesting, from the first information processing apparatus, address information of a second information processing apparatus connected to the first information processing apparatus via a network;

...
an acquisition means for acquiring first operation screen information for displaying a first operation screen corresponding to the first information processing apparatus and second operation screen information for displaying a second operation screen corresponding to the second information processing apparatus; and

a display means for displaying the first operation screen and the second operation screen, wherein

the control means controls the second information processing apparatus via the first information processing apparatus based on the address information.

(emphasis added). *Sato* does not disclose the claimed “request means,” “acquisition means,” “display means,” and “control means.”

Sato discloses a karaoke system. The karaoke system includes a CCTV center system 100 that receives requests from terminal systems R1 and R2. Based on the requests, CCTV center system 100 may transmit “signals of music pieces to be played and relevant video images to the terminal systems R1, R2” (col. 1, lines 38-39).

Sato does not teach or suggest an apparatus that includes “a request means for requesting, from the first information processing apparatus, address information of a second information processing apparatus connected to the first information processing apparatus via a network,” as recited in claim 7. CCTV center system 100 does not request, from terminal system R1, “address information” of terminal system R2.

In addition, CCTV center system 100 does not acquire and display screen information received from terminal systems R1 and R2. Accordingly, *Sato* does not teach or suggest “an acquisition means for acquiring first operation screen information for displaying a first operation screen corresponding to the first information processing apparatus and second operation screen information for displaying a second operation screen corresponding to the second information processing apparatus” and “a display means for displaying the first operation screen and the second operation screen,” as recited in claim 7.

Moreover, CCTV center system 100 does not control terminal system R2 via terminal system R1. Therefore, *Sato* also does not teach or suggest “the control means controls the second information processing apparatus via the first information processing apparatus based on the address information,” as further recited in claim 7.

Sato fails to anticipate claim 7, and claim 7 is allowable. Claim 8 is also allowable at least due to its depending from claim 7. Independent claims 9 and 10 are allowable over *Sato* for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 7.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 09812.0395-00
Application No. 10/509,480

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 26, 2008

By: 
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921